



GTE Service Corporation

1850 M Street, N.W., Suite 1200
Washington, D.C. 20036-5801
202 463-5200
Fax: 202 463-5298

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

July 29, 1998

Ms. Magalie R. Salas
Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
1919 M Street, N.W., Room 222
Washington, DC 20554

RECEIVED

JUL 29 1998

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

**Re: Ex Parte: Revision of the Commission's Rules to Ensure Compatibility with
Enhanced 911 Emergency Calling Systems - CC Docket No. 94-102**

Dear Ms. Salas:

On July 29, 1998, representatives of GTE met with Mr. John Cimko, Ms. Nancy Boocker, Mr. Martin Liebman, Mr. Ron Netro, and Mr. Dan Grosh of the Commission's Wireless Telecommunications Bureau. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss GTE's positions with respect to cost recovery, technology selection, and indemnity in the above-captioned proceeding and to provide an update on phase 1 implementation. The attached material was used in the discussion.

Please include a copy of this notification and the attached discussion material into the record of this proceeding in accordance with Section 1.1206(b)(1) of the Commission's rules concerning ex parte communications. Please feel free to call me if you have any questions regarding this matter.

Sincerely,


May Chan

Attachment

cc: J. Cimko
N. Boocker
W. Kim
M. Liebman
R. Netro
D. Grosh

No. of Copies rec'd 0+1
LIS ABODE

GTE Wireless E9-1-1

- ◆ PHASE I
- ◆ COST RECOVERY
- ◆ TECHNOLOGY ISSUES PHASE I AND PHASE II
- ◆ INDEMNITY
- ◆ STRONGEST SIGNAL

GTE Wireless E9-1-1

- ◆ PHASE I UPDATE
- ◆ SELECTED XYPOINT AS 911 PROVIDER
- ◆ SELECTED A NCAS SOLUTION
- ◆ STACK RANKED STATES AND MARKETS
- ◆ MARKETS IN PROGRESS INDIANAPOLIS, IND. AND AUSTIN, TX.

GTE WIRELESS E9-1-1

◆ ADDITIONAL MARKETS

- Houston, TX
- Memphis, TN
- Alabama
- Kentucky
- California
- Indiana
- Virginia

COST RECOVERY ISSUES

- ◆ STATE MANDATED CHARGES 9 STATES
- ◆ IN PROGRESS 4 STATES
- ◆ SELF IMPOSED OR LOCAL ORDINANCE
GEORGIA COUNTY BY COUNTY
WASHINGTON COUNTY BY COUNTY
- ◆ OTHER EXPECTED IN 1999

Technology Issues

◆ PHASE I

- CAS VERSUS NCAS CHOICES
- COOPERATION FROM LECs
- PSAP KNOWLEDGE LEVEL
- NATIONAL PLAN
- GTEW CHOICE OF CARRIER

CARRIER CHOICE

- ◆ HISTORIC CHOICE FOR SERVICE IS CARRIER
- ◆ EASE OF IMPLEMENTATION STANDARD
- ◆ PHASE II PLATFORM
- ◆ COOPERATIVE VENTURE WITH PSAP
- ◆ STATUS OF MOST PSAP TECHNOLOGY
- ◆ NEED FOR EXTERNAL SME's



PHASE II TECHNOLOGY TRIALS

◆ HOUSTON

◆ AUSTIN

◆ SNAP TRACK

◆ OTHERS

IDC WASHINGTON STATE

GTE LABS AND GTENS

HOUSTON TRIAL

- ◆ THIS IS A TRIAL, NOT DEPLOYMENT
- ◆ LEVEL PLAYING FIELD FOR CDMA NOT PRESENT
- ◆ ARGUABLE SELECTION CHOICE
- ◆ COMPETITIVE RISKS

OTHER TRIALS

- ◆ AUSTIN TEST BEFORE ACCEPTANCE
POLITICAL OVERSIGHT ACSEC
- ◆ NCAS SOLUTION WITH PSAP AND LEC
COOPERATION SLOWWWW
- ◆ NEED OPEN INTERFACE

PHASE II RISKS

- ◆ CHOICE OF TECHNOLOGY CARRIER VS PSAP
- ◆ VENDORS SHOULD MARKET TO CARRIER
- ◆ COMPATIBILITY WITH SWITCH TECHNOLOGY
- ◆ HANDSET-BASED SOLUTIONS
- ◆ SOME CARRIERS PRECLUDED FOR COMPLIANCE

INDEMNITY

- ◆ NEED FOR SAME PROTECTION IN STATES AS INCUMBENT LEC
- ◆ ADMIN TARIFF FILING OPTION
- ◆ INSURANCE OPTION
- ◆ CALIFORNIA ISSUE

STRONGEST SIGNAL

◆ GTEW POSITION

- OPPOSE
- REVIEW PROCESS
- REQUIRES
MODIFICATION OF ANALOG PHONES
- ASSUMPTION of HIGHER CALL
COMPLETION
- ONLY ANALOG REQUIREMENT